

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

CASE NO.:

DOUG LONGHINI,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE MORTGAGE BANK  
BUILDING, LLC.,

Defendant.

---

**COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, individually and on behalf of all other similarly situated mobility-impaired individuals (hereinafter “Plaintiff”), sues THE MORTGAGE BANK BUILDING, LLC., (hereinafter “Defendant”), and as grounds alleges:

**JURISDICTION, PARTIES, AND VENUE**

1. This is an action for injunctive relief, a declaration of rights, attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, and costs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181, et seq., (the “Americans with Disabilities Act” or “ADA”) and 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

2. The Court has original jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s claims arising under 42 U.S.C. § 12181, et seq. pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343 and 42 U.S.C. § 12117(a).

3. The Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, and may render declaratory judgment on the existence or nonexistence of any right under 42 U.S.C. § 12181, et seq.

4. Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, is an individual over eighteen years of age, with a

residence in Miami-Dade County, Florida, and is otherwise *sui juris*.

5. At all times material, Defendant, THE MORTGAGE BANK BUILDING, LLC., owned and operated a commercial building at 7200 NW 7<sup>th</sup> Street Miami, Florida 33126 (hereinafter the “Commercial Property”) and conducted a substantial amount of business in that place of public accommodation in Miami Dade County, Florida.

6. At all times material, Defendant, THE MORTGAGE BANK BUILDING, LLC., was and is a Florida Limited Liability Company, organized under the laws of Florida with its principal place of business in Miami, Florida.

7. Venue is properly located in the Southern District of Florida because Defendant’s Commercial Property is located in Miami-Dade County, Florida, Defendant regularly conducts business within Miami Dade County, Florida, and because a substantial part(s) of the events or omissions giving rise to these claims occurred in Miami-Dade County, Florida.

#### FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

8. Although over thirty (30) years have passed since the effective date of Title III of the ADA, Defendant has yet to make its facilities accessible to individuals with disabilities.

9. Congress provided commercial businesses one and a half years to implement the Act. The effective date was January 26, 1992. In spite of this abundant lead-time and the extensive publicity the ADA has received since 1990, Defendant has continued to discriminate against people who are disabled in ways that block them from access and use of Defendant’s property and the businesses therein.

10. The ADA prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in 28 CFR 36.201 and requires landlords and tenants to be liable for compliance

11. Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, is an individual with disabilities as defined by and

pursuant to the ADA. DOUG LONGHINI uses a wheelchair to ambulate. DOUG LONGHINI has very limited use of his hands and cannot operate any mechanisms which require tight grasping or twisting of the wrist. He also has a great deal of trouble walking or otherwise ambulating without the use of a wheelchair. He is limited in his major life activities by such, including but not limited to walking, standing, grabbing, grasping and/or pinching.

12. Defendant, THE MORTGAGE BANK BUILDING, LLC., owns, operates and oversees the Commercial Property, its general parking lot and parking spots specific to the businesses therein.

13. The subject Commercial Property is open to the public and is located in Miami, Florida. The individual Plaintiff visits the Commercial Property, to include a visit to the Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property on or about August 17, 2022 and encountered multiple violations of the ADA that directly affected his ability to use and enjoy the Commercial Property. He often visits the Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property in order to avail himself of the goods and services offered there, and because it is approximately eleven (11) miles from his residence, and is near his friends' residences as well as other businesses and restaurants he frequents as a patron. He plans to return to the Commercial Property within two (2) months from the date of the filing of this Complaint.

14. The Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, found the Commercial Property to be rife with ADA violations. The Plaintiff encountered architectural barriers at the Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property and wishes to continue his patronage and use of each of the premises.

15. The Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, has encountered architectural barriers that are in violation of the ADA at the subject Commercial Property. The barriers to access at Defendant's

Commercial Property have each denied or diminished Plaintiff's ability to visit the Commercial Property and have endangered his safety in violation of the ADA. The barriers to access, which are set forth below, have likewise posed a risk of injury(ies), embarrassment, and discomfort to Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, and others similarly situated.

16. Defendant, THE MORTGAGE BANK BUILDING, LLC., owns and operates a place of public accommodation as defined by the ADA and the regulations implementing the ADA, 28 CFR 36.201 (a) and 36.104. Defendant, THE MORTGAGE BANK BUILDING, LLC., is responsible for complying with the obligations of the ADA. The place of public accommodation that Defendant, THE MORTGAGE BANK BUILDING, LLC., owns and operates the Commercial Property Business located at 7200 NW 7<sup>th</sup> Street Miami, Florida 33126.

17. Defendant, THE MORTGAGE BANK BUILDING, LLC., as landlord and owner of the Commercial Property, is responsible for all ADA violations listed in this Complaint.

18. Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, has a realistic, credible, existing and continuing threat of discrimination from the Defendant's non-compliance with the ADA with respect to the described Commercial Property, including but not necessarily limited to the allegations of this Complaint. Plaintiff has reasonable grounds to believe that he will continue to be subjected to discrimination at the Commercial Property, in violation of the ADA. Plaintiff desires to visit the Commercial Property and businesses located therein, not only to avail himself of the goods and services available at the Commercial Property, but to assure himself that the Commercial Property is in compliance with the ADA, so that he and others similarly situated will have full and equal enjoyment of the Commercial Property without fear of discrimination.

19. Defendant has discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying him access to, and full and equal enjoyment of, the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or

accommodations of the Commercial Property, as prohibited by 42 U.S.C. § 12182 et seq.

### **ADA VIOLATIONS**

20. The Plaintiff adopts and re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 19 above as though fully set forth herein.

21. Defendant, THE MORTGAGE BANK BUILDING, LLC., has discriminated, and continues to discriminate, against Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing, inter alia, to have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). A list of the violations that Plaintiff encountered during his visit to the Commercial Property, include but are not limited to, the following:

#### **A. Parking**

- i. There are accessible parking spaces that do not provide signs designating them as accessible, violating Section 4.6.4 of the ADAAG and Section 502.6 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. The Plaintiff had difficulty exiting the vehicle, as an access aisle of the required width is not provided. Violation: There are accessible parking spaces that do not have compliant access aisles provided, violating Sections 4.1.2(5a) and 4.6.3 of the ADAAG and Section 502.3.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

#### **B. Entrance Access and Path of Travel**

- i. The Plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel, as it is not continuous and accessible. Violation: There are inaccessible routes from the public sidewalk and transportation stop. These are violations of the requirements in Sections 4.3.2(1), 4.3.8, 4.5.1, and 4.5.2 of the ADAAG and Sections 206.2.1, 302.1, 303, and 402.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

- ii. The Plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel due to abrupt changes in level. Violation: There are vertical changes in levels of greater than ½ inch, violating Sections 4.3.8 and 4.5.2 of the ADAAG and Section 303 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iii. The Plaintiff had difficulty on the path of travel at the facility, as ramps do not have compliant handrails violating Section 4.8.5 of the ADAAG and Section 405.8 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iv. The Plaintiff had difficulty using ramps, as they are located on an excessive slope. Violation: Ramps at the facility contain excessive slopes, violating Section 4.8.2 of the ADAAG and Section 405.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- v. The Plaintiff had difficulty entering tenant spaces without assistance, as the door hardware requires tight grasping. Violation: The tenant entrance doors have non-compliant hardware for disabled patrons, violating Section 4.13.9 of the ADAAG and Sections 309.4 and 404.2.7 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

C. Access to Goods and Services

- i. There are drinking fountains that don't provide access to those who have difficulty bending or stooping. Violation: There are drinking fountains that are in violation of Section 4.1.3(10) of the ADAAG and Sections 211.2 & 602.7 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

D. Public Restrooms

- i. There are permanently designated interior spaces without proper signage, violating Section 4.1.3(16) and 4.30 of the ADAAG and Sections 216.2 and 703 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

- ii. The Plaintiff could not exit the restroom without assistance, as the required maneuvering clearance was not provided due to the location of a trashcan. Violation: The restroom door does not provide the required latch side clearance due to a lack of maintenance violating Section 4.13.6 of the ADAAG, 28 CFR 36.211, and Section 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iii. The Plaintiff had difficulty using the doorknob and locking mechanism on the restroom door without assistance, as they require tight grasping. Violation: The restroom door has non-compliant hardware for disabled patrons, violating Sections 4.13.9 & 4.27.4 of the ADAAG and Sections 309.4 & 404.2.7 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iv. The Plaintiff could not use the accessible toilet compartment door without assistance, as it is not self-closing and does not have compliant door hardware. Violation: The accessible toilet compartment door does not provide hardware and features that comply with Sections 4.17.5 and 4.13.9 of the ADAAG and Sections 309.4 and 604.8.1.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- v. The Plaintiff could not use the toilet compartment without assistance, as one of the required size is not provided: Violation: The toilet compartments provided for public use at the facility are in violation of Section 4.17.3 and Figure 30(a) of the ADAAG and Section 604.8.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- vi. The Plaintiff could not use the coat hook without assistance, as it is mounted too high. Violation: There are coat hooks provided for public use in the restroom, outside the reach ranges prescribed in Sections 4.2.5, 4.2.6, and 4.25.3 of the ADAAG and Sections 308 and 604.8.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

- vii. The Plaintiff could not use the toilet paper dispenser without assistance, as it is not mounted at the required location. Violation: The toilet paper dispenser in the accessible toilet compartment is not mounted in accordance with Section 4.17.6 and Figure 30(d) of the ADAAG and Section 604.7 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- viii. The Plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as the grab bars are missing. Violation: The grab bars in the accessible toilet compartment do not comply with the requirements prescribed in Section 4.17.6 of the ADAAG and Sections 604.5 and 609 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ix. The Plaintiff had difficulty entering the restroom without assistance, as the door threshold is too high. Violation: There are threshold rises in excess of ½ inch at the restroom entrances, violating Section 4.13.8 of the ADAAG and Section 404.2.5 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- x. The Plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as objects are mounted less than 12” above a grab bar obstructing its use. Violation: The grab bars in the accessible toilet compartment do not comply with the requirements prescribed in Sections 4.17.6 and 4.26 of the ADAAG and Section 609.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- xi. The Plaintiff was exposed to a cutting/burning hazard because the lavatory pipes are not wrapped. Violation: The lavatory pipes are not fully wrapped or insulated violating Section 4.19.4 of the ADAAG and Section 606.5 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- xii. The Plaintiff could not use the lavatory without assistance, as the required knee clearance is



not provided. Violation: There are lavatories in public restrooms without the required clearances provided, violating the requirements in Section 4.19.2 and Figure 31 of the ADAAG and Sections 306 and 606.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

xiii. The Plaintiff could not use the mirror, as it is mounted too high. Violation: The mirrors provided in the restrooms are in violation of the requirements in Section 4.19.6 of the ADAAG and Section 603.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

xiv. The Plaintiff could not use the paper towel dispenser without assistance, as it is mounted too high. Violation: There are dispensers provided for public use in the restroom, with controls outside the ranges prescribed in Sections 4.2.5, 4.2.6, and 4.27.3 of the ADAAG and Sections 308 & 309.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

### **RELIEF SOUGHT AND THE BASIS**

22. The discriminatory violations described in this Complaint are not an exclusive list of the Defendant's ADA violations. Plaintiff requests an inspection of the Defendant's places of public accommodation in order to photograph and measure all of the discriminatory acts violating the ADA and barriers to access in conjunction with Rule 34 and timely notice. Plaintiff further requests to inspect any and all barriers to access that were concealed by virtue of the barriers' presence, which prevented Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, from further ingress, use, and equal enjoyment of the Commercial; Plaintiff requests to be physically present at such inspection in conjunction with Rule 34 and timely notice. A Plaintiff requests the inspection in order to participate in crafting a remediation plan to address Plaintiff's request for injunctive relief. The remediations for the ADA violations listed herein are readily achievable.

23. The Plaintiff, and all other individuals similarly situated, have been denied access to, and have been denied full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities privileges, benefits, programs and activities offered by Defendant's Commercial Property and the businesses within the Commercial Property; and has otherwise been discriminated against and damaged by the Defendant because of the Defendant's ADA violations as set forth above. The Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested herein. In order to remedy this discriminatory situation, the Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Defendant's place of public accommodation in order to determine all of the areas of non-compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Plaintiff further requests a remediation plan and the opportunity to participate in the crafting of the remediation plan in order to participate in crafting a remediation plan to address Plaintiff's request for injunctive relief.

24. Defendant has discriminated against the Plaintiff by denying him access to full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of their places of public accommodation or commercial facility, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq. and 28 CFR 36.302 et seq. Defendant has also discriminated against Plaintiff in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12131 et seq. and 28 C.F.R. Part 35 et seq for excluding Plaintiff by reason of disability from participation in and denying him benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity. Furthermore, the Defendant continues to discriminate against Plaintiff, and all those similarly situated, by failing to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such efforts that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services,

segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services.

25. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law, will suffer irreparable harm, and have a clear legal right to the relief sought. Further, injunctive relief will serve the public interest and all those similarly situated to Plaintiff. Plaintiff has retained the undersigned counsel and is entitled to recover attorneys' fees, costs and litigation expenses from Defendant pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205 and 28 CFR 36.505.

26. Defendant is required to remove the existing architectural barriers to the physically disabled when such removal is readily achievable for their place of public similarly situated, will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested herein. In order to remedy this discriminatory situation, the Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Defendant's place of public accommodation in order to determine all of the areas of non-compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

27. Notice to Defendant is not required as a result of the Defendant's failure to cure the violations by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). All other conditions precedent have been met by the Plaintiff or waived by the Defendant.

28. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188, this Court is provided with authority to grant Plaintiff's Injunctive Relief, including an order to alter the property where Defendant operates its business, located within the Commercial Property located in Miami, Florida, the interiors, exterior areas, and the common exterior areas of the Commercial Property to make those facilities readily accessible and useable to the Plaintiff and all other mobility-impaired persons; or by closing the facility until such time as the Defendant cures its violations of the ADA.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, respectfully requests that this Honorable Court issue (i) a Declaratory Judgment determining Defendant, at the commencement of the subject lawsuit, were and are in violation of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq. and Title II the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12131; (ii) Injunctive relief against Defendant, including an order to make all readily achievable alterations to the facilities; or to make such facilities readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA; and to require Defendant to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such steps that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services; (iii) An award of attorneys' fees, costs and litigation expenses pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and (iv) such other relief as the Court deems just and proper, and/or is allowable under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Dated: October 5, 2022

**GARCIA-MENOCAL & PEREZ, P.L.**

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

4937 S.W. 74<sup>th</sup> Court

Miami, Florida 33155

Telephone: (305) 553-3464

Facsimile: (305) 553-3031

Primary E-Mail: ajperez@lawgmp.com

Secondary E-Mails: bvirues@lawgmp.com

dperaza@lawgmp.com

By: /s/ Anthony J. Perez

ANTHONY J. PEREZ

Florida Bar No.: 535451

BEVERLY VIRUES

Florida Bar No.: 123713